

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/649,241	08/27/2003	Simon D. Seaton	HES 2003-IP-011197U1	6018	
29920 7.	590 08/04/2005		EXAMINER		
JOHN W. WUSTENBERG			DANG, HOANG C		
P.O. BOX 1431 DUNCAN, OK 73536			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
201.01.1., 01	- 10000		3672		
			DATE MAILED: 08/04/200	DATE MAILED: 08/04/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
· .	10/649,241	SEATON ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Hoang Dang	3672				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	0					
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE!	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on		·				
	 action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers		·				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>27 August 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/27/2003. 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other:						
	· — —					

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schulte et al (US 6,510,947) or Adams et al (US 2.003/0132141) in view of Echols et al (US 5,842,522), or vice versa.

Schulte et al or Adams et al disclose a shale shaker screen assembly and methods for using it to remove particulate matter from a drilling fluid being pumped into or out of a wellbore being drilled. Both Schulte et al and Adams et al teach forming the screen material used to form the shale shaker screen of 316 stainless steel (see column 8, line 29 and column 11, lines 37-42 in Schulte et al and paragraph [0035] in Adams et al). Echols et al disclose a sand control screen used in a well. Echols et al disclose that the screen material used to form the sand control screen is 316 stainless steel (column 2, lines 12-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a sand control screen as taught by Echols et al in the wellbore of Schulte et al or Adams et al when the well is placed in production to prevent the production of sand as taught by Echols et al (see column 1, lines 13-29).

Alternatively, it would also have been obvious to use a shale shaker screen as taught by Schulte et la or Adams et al during the drilling operation to drill the wellbore of Echols et al in order to remove solids from the drilling mud to minimize wear on mud pumps and other mechanical equipment used for drilling (see column 1, lines 35-55 in Schulte et al and Paragraph [0011] in Adams et al).

It is noted that since the screen material of Echols et al the screen material of Schulte et al and Adams et al is 316 stainless steel, the shale shaker screen of Schulte et al and Adams et al is formed of the same type of screen material used to form the sand control screen as recited.

Regarding claims 10, 14, 17, 21 and 22, one of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that the selected pore size of a screen depends on the nature of the formation and would have been obvious.

The remaining claims read exactly on at least one of the applied references.

Conclusion

- The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hoang Dang whose telephone number is 571-272-7028. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:15-5:45 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Bagnell can be reached on 571-272-6999. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3672

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hoang Dang Primary Examiner Art Unit 3672